

1 Norman E. Siegel (*admitted pro hac vice*)
2 *siegel@stuevesiegel.com*
3 STUEVE SIEGEL HANSON LLP
4 460 Nichols Road, Suite 200
5 Kansas City, Missouri 64112
Phone: (816) 714-7100
Fax: (816) 714-7101

6 Thomas S. Stewart (*admitted pro hac vice*)
7 *stewart@swm.legal*
8 STEWART, WALD & MCCULLEY, LLC
9 2100 Central, Suite 22
0 Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: (816) 303-1500
Fax: (816) 527-8068

11 | Plaintiffs' Interim Co-Lead Counsel

12 | *[See Additional Counsel on Signature Page]*

15 James Paul Mooney; and Lazy Coyote RV
16 Village, LLC, on behalf of themselves and
all others similarly situated.

CLASS ACTION

**LEAD CASE NO. 2:15-cv-01092-DGC
(Consolidated with Case No. 2:15-cv-
01380-DGC)**

Plaintiffs.

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
VACATE AND TEMPORARILY
SUSPEND ENTRY OF COURT'S
FEBRUARY 21, 2017 ORDER**

20 Union Pacific Railroad Company,
successor to Southern Pacific
21 Transportation Company; SFPP, L.P.
(formerly known as Santa Fe Pacific
22 Pipelines, Inc., formerly known as
Southern Pacific Pipelines, Inc.); Kinder
23 Morgan Operating L.P. “D”; and Kinder
24 Morgan G P, Inc.

Honorable David G. Campbell

Defendants.

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1, Plaintiffs respectfully request that
 2 this Court vacate and temporarily suspend entry of its February 21, 2017 Order (Doc.
 3 260) relating to Plaintiffs' motion for class certification under Rule 23(b)(2) and (b)(3)
 4 until it enters an order regarding Plaintiffs' motion for class certification under Rule
 5 23(c)(4). This would permit a more efficient consolidated process for appeal pursuant to
 6 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(f) by one or more parties after the Court's
 7 determination of certification under Rule 23(c)(4). Defendants do not oppose the
 8 objective of facilitating simultaneous appeal schedules, but oppose the procedural
 9 mechanism to accomplish that goal by vacating the Order.

10 On February 21, 2016, this Court entered an Order denying Plaintiffs' motion for
 11 class certification under Rule 23(b)(2) and (b)(3). Doc. 260. Under Rule 23(f), Plaintiffs'
 12 deadline to file a petition for permission to appeal is "14 days after the order is entered,"
 13 which is March 7, 2016. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(f). However, this Court is currently
 14 considering whether to certify an issues class under Rule 23(c)(4). Doc. 260 at 1-2 & 33-
 15 35. Thus, the deadlines to request permission to appeal by any party will be different for
 16 the Court's ruling relating to Rule 23(c)(4) than the Court's Order regarding Rule
 17 23(b)(2) and (b)(3).

18 Due to the staggered appellate deadlines, the Ninth Circuit will likely be faced
 19 with multiple, piecemeal petitions for permission to appeal, which will unnecessarily
 20 burden the Ninth Circuit with several briefs containing repetitive arguments. This
 21 situation can be avoided entirely if this Court temporarily vacates its certification Order
 22 relating to Rule 23(b)(2) and (b)(3) until it rules on Plaintiffs' request for certification
 23 under Rule 23(c)(4), thereby synchronizing the appellate deadlines and allowing any
 24 request for appeal under Rule 23(f) to be presented in a single petition or simultaneous
 25 cross petitions.

26 A district court has inherent power to rescind, reconsider, or modify an
 27 interlocutory order. *See United States v. Martin*, 226 F.3d 1042, 1049 (9th Cir. 2000)

1 (noting that a district court has the inherent authority to modify, alter, or revoke any non-
 2 final order); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b) (providing interlocutory orders “may be
 3 revised at any time before the entry of a judgment adjudicating all claims and all the
 4 parties’ rights and liabilities.”). Importantly, this Motion is not seeking reconsideration of
 5 the Court’s February 21, 2017 Order, but simply for the Court to delay entry of the Order
 6 until it enters an order relating to Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification under Rule
 7 23(c)(4).

8 Additionally, Plaintiffs’ counsel contacted Defendants’ counsel regarding the
 9 subject matter of this Motion. Counsel for Kinder Morgan indicated that Kinder Morgan
 10 opposes vacating this Court’s Order but agrees with the concept of facilitating
 11 simultaneous appeals if there are alternative procedural mechanisms to accomplish this
 12 goal. Union Pacific’s position is in accord with Kinder Morgan’s position. Thus, all
 13 parties agree with the purpose of this Motion. To that end, as a potential alternative to
 14 vacating its Order, this Court could enter a separate order holding that its February 21,
 15 2017 Order is being held in abeyance and is not to be entered until the Court rules on the
 16 remainder of Plaintiffs’ class certification motion. Nonetheless, Plaintiffs are not seeking
 17 to elevate form over substance, especially considering all parties agree on the aim of
 18 establishing simultaneous appellate deadlines.

19 Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court vacate its Order dated
 20 February 21, 2017 (Doc. 260) until it rules on Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification
 21 under Rule 23(c)(4). Alternatively, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court hold its
 22 Order dated February 21, 2017 (Doc. 260) in abeyance until it rules on Plaintiffs’ motion
 23 for class certification under Rule 23(c)(4).

24

25

26

27

28

1
2 Dated: March 2, 2017

3 Thomas S. Stewart (*admitted pro hac vice*)
4 Elizabeth G. McCulley
(*admitted pro hac vice*)
5 STEWART, WALD & MCCULLEY, LLC
2100 Central, Suite 22
6 Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: (816) 303-1500
7 Fax: (816) 527-8068
8 stewart@swm.legal
mcculley@swm.legal

9
10 Steven M. Wald (*admitted pro hac vice*)
11 STEWART, WALD & MCCULLEY, LLC
12 12747 Olive Blvd., Suite 280
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
Phone: (314) 720-6190
13 Fax: (314) 400-7724
wald@swm.legal

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Norman E. Siegel
Norman E. Siegel (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Barrett J. Vahle (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Ethan M. Lange (*admitted pro hac vice*)
STUEVE SIEGEL HANSON LLP
460 Nichols Road, Suite 200
Kansas City, Missouri 64112
Phone: (816) 714-7100
Fax: (816) 714-7101
siegel@stuevesiegel.com
vahle@stuevesiegel.com
lange@stuevesiegel.com

15 ***Plaintiffs' Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel***

16 John W. Cowden (*admitted pro hac vice*)
17 BAKER STERCHI COWDEN & RICE, L.L.C.
2400 Pershing Road, Suite 500
18 Kansas City, MO 64108
Phone: (816) 471-2121
19 Fax: (816) 472-0288
cowden@bscr-law.com

Francis A. Bottini, Jr.
(*admitted pro hac vice*)
BOTTINI & BOTTINI, INC.
7817 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 102
La Jolla, California 92037
Phone: (858) 914-2001
Fax: (858) 914-2002
fbottini@bottinilaw.com

21 Kathryn Honecker (AZ Bar No. 020849)
ROSE LAW GROUP PC
22 7144 E Stetson Drive, Suite 300
23 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
Phone: (480) 291-0744
24 Fax: (480) 505-3925
khonecker@roselawgroup.com

25
26 ***Additional Plaintiffs' Counsel***

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that, on March 2, 2017, I electronically filed the above and
3 foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which transmitted notice of
4 the filing to all counsel of record.

5
6 _____
7 /s/ Norman E. Siegel
8
9 _____
10 Norman E. Siegel

9 **CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

10 I hereby certify that, on March 1, 2017, a lawyer from my firm contacted counsel
11 for Defendants to inquire whether Defendants oppose the above motion. On March 2,
12 2017, counsel for Kinder Morgan stated that Kinder Morgan opposes any motion to
13 “vacate or modify” the Court’s Order dated February 21, 2017 (Doc. 260); however,
14 Kinder Morgan is “amenable to any reasonable mechanism that will allow the appellate
15 issues to be handled simultaneously.” Also on March 2, 2017, counsel for Union Pacific
16 responded that Union Pacific’s “position is in accord” with Kinder Morgan’s position.

17
18 _____
19 /s/ Norman E. Siegel
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28